

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA
9

10 KIMBERLEY THOMPSON,

CASE NO. C09-5799 BHS JRC

11 Plaintiff,

REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION

12 v.

13 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of
Social Security Administration,

Noted for July 30, 2010

14 Defendant.
15

16
17 This matter has been referred to Magistrate Judge J. Richard Creatura pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Magistrates Rule MJR 4(a)(4) and as authorized by Mathews v.
Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). Plaintiff brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g)
seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying an
application for disability insurance benefits.
22

23 This matter is before the court on the parties' stipulated motion to remand the matter to
the administration for further consideration. Doc. 17. The motion states that the parties agree the
matter should be reversed and remanded pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further
administrative proceedings, including, but not limited to, the following actions: the administrative
26

1 law judge (ALJ) will specifically define Plaintiff's limitations and abilities related to her need to sit
2 or stand, providing times and frequencies for and between each activity; obtain supplemental
3 vocational expert testimony to determine whether, in light of Plaintiff's residual functional capacity,
4 there is any work she could perform that exists in significant numbers; to explicitly determine the
5 number and occurrence of those jobs; and ask the vocational expert about whether their testimony
6 conflicts with the Dictionary of Occupational Titles and elicit explanations for any conflict. The ALJ
7 will perform any further development and conduct any further proceedings deemed necessary,
8 including additional issues discussed in Plaintiff's opening brief.
9

10 Based on the parties' agreement, the Court should remand the matter, pursuant to
11 sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), to the administration for further consideration as noted
12 above. Upon proper request to this Court, Plaintiff should be entitled to reasonable attorney fees
13 and costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d). The parties have submitted a proposed order and
14 judgment for the court's consideration.

15 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil
16 Procedure, the parties shall have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report to file written
17 objections. *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those
18 objections for purposes of appeal. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the
19 time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on **July**
20 **30, 2010**, as noted in the caption.

22 DATED at this 8th day of July, 2010.
23

24 
25 J. Richard Creatura
26 United States Magistrate Judge